GUIDELINES FOR EVALUATORS

M. J. Martin

Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, Tennessee

April, 1988

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GUIDELINES FOR DECAY AND REACTION DATA SETS

A. Extraction of Data

1. In any experiment, the author's basic measured quantities should be quoted, unless these data can be converted to more usual or convenient forms by applying known numerical factors (for example, mean-life to half-life, BE2(sp) to BE2).

Quote what was actually measured in an experiment and not what the author quotes, in cases where these are different.

> Note: A measurement of $I\gamma/\Sigma I\beta$ might be quoted by an author as $I\beta$(gs), which, for the author's decay scheme should be equivalent to the absolute $I\gamma$ determination, but is not as fundamental a quantity. If the decay scheme is changed, the $I\beta$(gs) could change, whereas the absolute $I\gamma$ measurement should still be valid. This distinction is an important one, and failure to make it is a particularly common source of confusion when normalization conditions are being stated.
>
> A measurement of $I\gamma^{+-}/I\gamma$ might be quoted by an author as $I\beta^{+}/I\gamma$. The ratio should be expressed in terms of the annihilation radiation since $I\beta^{+}/I\gamma$ could imply that the positron spectrum was measured.

2. Document any and all changes made in data quoted from an author. When correcting an author's value for a quantity, for example an error due to a misprint, give the corrected value in the appropriate field and mention the uncorrected value in a comment. Do not give the uncorrected value in the field and rely on the comment to explain what the correct value is.

3. When extracting data from an author's paper, note any assumptions, standards, or constants that enter into a derived value, and correct the data for any changes in these assumed values. For example, an ε/α ratio for one nucleus might depend on the value assumed for another nucleus, or a conversion coefficient might be normalized to a standard value. Such data should be presented in such a way that the effect of changes in any of the assumed values is clearly displayed; thus, "α_k-0.0324 12 if α_k=0.0324 12 if $\alpha_k(^{137}Cs)$-…". Better values for the assumed quantities might be available at the time the mass chain is being revised.

4. Check the bibliography in each article against the reference list provided by BNL. This is a valuable cross-check to help ensure that references have not been overlooked. Also, authors will sometimes quote data received as private communications. These data should be tracked down if possible if they seem important.

5. Do not rely on an author to extract older data correctly. Even if an author collects such data in a table, the original article should be checked. This checking procedure is especially important in view of 3 above.

6. Be sure to distinguish between values measured by an author and those deduced by the same author. For example, in a transfer reaction, an author might adopt L values for some transitions based on known $J\pi$ in order to extract values for other levels. Such a distinction should be made clear.

B. Manipulation and Presentation of Data

1. Comments

a) For data sets in which the data appear in two or more separate sections in the data sheets output, namely decay data sets and reaction data sets involving gammas, it is important that the comments be written in such a way that they are clearly separated into general comments, comments on levels, comments on gammas etc. This "separation" of comments avoids the problem of having comments appear where they are not appropriate (of course these comments can be edited out where they are not appropriate, but this is a step that should be avoided).

Note 1: A single comment such as "The level scheme is that of ... based on... The Eγ and Iγ are from …, with Iγ normalized so that... The Iβ are from the I(γ+ce) imbalance at each level" should be rewritten as separate general comments on levels, gammas, and betas or as specific data-type comments on Eγ, Iγ, Iβ, as appropriate.

Note 2: Comments on γγ(θ), γγ(t), γ(θ,H,T) etc. in a given data set should normally be given with levels rather than with gammas since it is usually under the levels listing that one wants to see comments on the values of J, T½, or μ etc., deduced in that data set from measurements of these types. If the γγ(θ) data also yield δ values, then the comment on δ in the gamma listing can simply state that the relevant γγ(θ) data are discussed in the levels listing.

b) General comments of a descriptive nature at the head of individual data sets should be kept to a minimum. In particular, comments for each keynumber that describe what was measured, such as Eγ, Iγ, or what detection method was used, such as semi, Ge(Li) are not required, but can be given at the evaluator's discretion. The only required comments are the specification of bombarding energy and energy resolution for reaction data sets. Projectile energy and experimental resolution should be given for each reference from which data are quoted, even if not a major source. Such information may also be useful for other references. For grouped reactions, such as (HI,xnγ) or Coul. ex., the bombarding particle would of course also need to be specified for each keynumber. In addition, for Coul. ex., the distinction between particle detection, (x,x'), and gamma detection, (x,x'γ) should be made. Examples are given in e) below.

Note 1: The bombarding energy and resolution for reference "A" are of interest in a case where, although most of the excitations energies are from some other source, reference "A", whose data are not otherwise included, reports a level not seen by the other sources, and the evaluator chooses to include this level. In many cases, evaluators refer to reference "A" only in a comment on the specific level in question; however, reference "A" should be included explicitly with the other references.

Note 2: The specification of "s", for spectrometer, is an example of the additional type of information that is probably not worth giving since it conveys only partial information on the experimental setup, It gives the analyzer; however, the fact that photographic plates and aluminum

absorbers, for example, were used may be of equal importance. In most cases it would be very difficult to write comments so exhaustive that the reader would not have to look at the paper to get the necessary experimental details, so there is no strong reason for giving just part of the picture. The specification of "semi" or "Ge(Li)" is also not really needed. Few modern papers contain "scin" data. It is probably useful to specify "cryst", however, since such measurements can be very precise, and also, the calibration uncertainties are then known to be proportional to Eγ.

Note 3: Specific comments such as "The Eγ are weighted averages from 77Sc02 and 79Fell. Others: 72Go04, 78Hi23", which specifies the important references for Eγ, are more informative than a set of keywords uncritically presented.

Note 4: The specification of the angular range, for example, might be useful in a case such as the assigning of L=O as opposed to L=2 in (α,α') for a giant resonance. This assignment requires knowing the angular yield variation at angles near zero. Indicating that this range was measured lends credence to an author's conclusion that L=O. The same information could, however, be given instead in a comment discussing the author's conclusion.

c) Do not put E=… on the ID record, except where needed to distinguish otherwise identical data sets, for example, (n,γ) E=th and (n,γ) E=res. The bombarding energy should be put in a comment. See examples in (e) below.

d) Except for even-even targets, Jπ(target) should be given for particle transfer reactions in which L values were determined. A general comment such as "Jπ(^{139}La)=7/2^{+}" is recommended. See examples in (e) below.

e) For readability of the comments referred to above, it is recommended that each keynumber, followed by the appropriate comments, be given on a separate line with the keynumber given first. The following are some examples.

^{208}Pb Levels from ^{208}Pb(d,d'),(pol d,d')

71Un0l E=13 MeV, FWHM=3-10 keV, θ=125°-150°
80Mo18 E=86 MeV, FWHM=lxl0^{-3}
80Wi12 E=108 MeV, θ=4°-14° (partial data also reported in 80Dj02)
Others: 62Jo05, 68Hi09

^{208}Pb Levels from Coulomb Excitation

69Ba51 (x,x') X=α, E=17-l9 MeV; x=^{16}0, E=69.1 MeV
71Gr3l (x,x'γ) x-α, E=15,18 MeV

^{208}Bi Levels from ^{207}Pb(^{3}He,d),(α,t) 71Al05

E(^{3}He)=30 MeV, FWHM AP 20 keV, θ=10°-70°
E(α)=30 MeV, θ=20°, 50°
Jπ(^{207}Pb)=1/2^{-}

^{208}Bi Levels from ^{208}Pb(p,n),(p,np') IAS

(p,n)	74Fi14	E-25.8 MeV
	80Ho21	E=120 MeV, FWHM AP 670 keV; 160 MeV, FWHM AP 1200 keV
	Others:	72Wo23, 71Wo04
(p,np')	73Wo04	E=30.5 MeV
	77Bh02	E=25 MeV, n-p' coin
	Others:	79LiZU, 71Wo04

2. Combining of data sets

Do not combine reactions that are of fundamentally different character, for example (p,p') and (n,n'), or one- and two-particle transfer reactions.

Except for Coulomb excitation, separate data sets should be created for particle and gamma reactions, for example (d,p) and (d,pγ), or (p,p') and (p,p'γ). Attempting to combine the different types of information usually presented in the two reactions leads to confusion in the presentation. Typically, one wants to present the L (and/or J) and S information from the particle work, and adopted Jπ for the gamma drawings.

The reaction (X,X') is intended to include (X,X). There is no need to include explicitly the special case of elastic scattering.

> Note: In general, we do not include in the data sheets the type of information extracted from elastic scattering, so it is rare that the reaction (X,X), by itself, would appear. One exception is the case of resonance work, where information on resonances in the compound nucleus can be obtained and may be of importance (see F. below). Information on nuclear shapes and charge densities, etc., deduced from elastic scattering can be given, or referred to, in adopted levels without the need for an (X,X) source data set.

3. Sources of data.

The sources of data for all headings, for example E(level), Iγ, δ, L, S, should be given unless "obvious". The final decision as to whether a source is obvious or not will reside with the editors. Keep in mind that each evaluator has the responsibility to ensure that the data presented are traceable to their source. When more than one keynumber is included on an ID record, it is important to state from which keynumber the individual pieces of data are taken. If a reader wants to check an E, an Iγ, or a S, for example, that reader should be able to go directly to the relevant reference, or references.

> Note: A comment on Iγ, stating "from X" or "weighted average of data from X and y" is preferable to requiring the reader to deduce the sources of data based on the keywords in the general comments described in (1) above.

4. Placement of gamma records.

For consistency in presenting drawings (and for convenience in reading data bank listings) gammas should be placed in order of increasing energy following each level. This same order should be followed in the unplaced gammas listing.

5. Significant digits.

When converting values from one set of "units" to another, for example, half-life to mean-Iife, or renormalizing Iγ values, enough digits should be retained so that the inverse operation will reproduce the original values. Note that in some cases this will result in more digits being quoted in the converted value than in the original value. This procedure is especially important when dealing with quantities determined with fairly high precision. For example, from BE2=0.384 4 one should report T1/2=7.27 ps 8, not 7.3 ps 1, and from a mean-Iife of 32 ps 1, one should report T1/2=22.2 ps 7, not 22 ps I. Another way of stating this principle is that the fractional uncertainty in the original value should be preserved (to the same number of significant digits) in the converted value.

When taking a weighted or unweighted average, quote a sufficient number of digits to correspond to our round-off procedure, that is, whenever possible, quote two digits for uncertainties up to 25. For example, a weighted average of 6.0 1 and 6.1 1 should be quoted as 6.057.

6. Multiplets.

a) Unless a complex peak in a reaction spectrum is resolved in a given experiment, a single "level" entry should be made. For example, in the case of a peak suspected, on the basis of work from other experiments, of being made up of two levels with Jπ=a and Jπ=b, respectively, a single level with "Jπ=a and b" in the Jπ field should be introduced. The inclusion in this data set of two levels involves making an explicit assumption that is not necessary. The probable level association can be adequately explained in a comment. The same approach should be used with gammas. A multiply placed transition seen as a single peak in the spectrum should appear in the output as one transition with multiple placements. Do not introduce additional transitions (with artificially altered energies, or energies taken from the level scheme).

Note: If the intensity of a gamma multiplet is not divided among the several placements, then the full intensity, with uncertainty, should be given for each placement, along with a "&" in column 77. Do not enter the intensities as limits in source data sets (the converse is true in adopted gammas, where multiply-placed Iγ should be entered as upper limits. See Note under E. 2. in GUIDELINES FOR ADOPTED LEVELS) .If the intensities are divided, for example on .the basis of γγ, then a "@" should be entered in column 77. These entries will automatically generate footnotes explaining that the transitions are multiply placed and that the intensities are not divided (for "&"), or are suitably divided (for "@").

b) If a gamma transition or a peak in a reaction spectrum is claimed to be a multiplet, the basis for this claim should be given. For example, the gamma peak might be broad, or coincidence data might suggest that a peak is a multiplet. In the case of a peak in a reaction spectrum, it is important to distinguish between experimental arguments such as "peak is broad", and theoretical arguments such as "C2S is too large for a single level on the basis of shell model expectations".

c) In the case of gamma-ray multiplets where Iγ (peak) in a specific data set cannot be decomposed on the basis of data available in that data set, but branchings involving one of more of the members of the multiplet are available from other data sets, then Iγ for members of the multiplet should be deduced where possible using such branchings. Appropriate comments, such as "Iγ: From

Iγ(326γ)/Iγ(432γ) in β- decay", are of course needed, and a "@" should be entered in column 77.

d) A multipolarity determined for a multiplet will not necessarily be correct for each, or perhaps even any, member of the multiplet. For example, depending on the relative strengths of the components, the I(γ) and I(cek) for a doublet consisting of an El and Ml component could yield mult=E2. The mult for the doublet should be given in a comment, but should not be entered in the mult field of the individual components, unless additional information is available that justifies the assignments.

Note: In a case where the I(γ) but not the I(cek) (or vice-versa) is resolved, and the multipolarity of one component of a doublet is known from other sources, it may be possible to deduce the multipolarity for the other component.

7. It is recommended that cross sections, analyzing-power, and angular-distribution coefficients not be given explicitly. It is sufficient simply to mention that such measurements were made, in the context of justifying any conclusions based on such data. The conclusions themselves, of course, should be given.

Note: If an evaluator feels that the angular distribution coefficients do need to be given, then they should be given in the form A2, A4, not A2/Ao, A4/Ao. That is, we define the angular distribution function as W(θ)=1+A2P2(cos θ)+..., not as Ao+A2P2(COS θ)+...

8. (γ,γ') experiments

Some confusion and a lack of consistency in the presentation of data exists in experiments on resonant fluorescence. The most common type of measurement in these experiments is scattering, which, for the case of photons scattered elastically from a thin target, yields the quantity $gW(\theta)\Gamma(\gamma 0)^2/\Gamma$. where g=(2J+1)/(2Jo+1), with J-resonance level spin, Jo=gs spin, and W is the usual angular correlation function. For inelastic scattering, the term $\Gamma(\gamma o)^2$ in the numerator should be replaced by Γ(γO)Γ(γi) where Γ(γi) refers to the deexciting transition to excited level with J=Ji. In this type of experiment. the quantity $gW\Gamma(\gamma o)^2/\Gamma$. or just $\Gamma(\gamma o)^2/\Gamma$, if J and W are known, should be given. The adopted value for Γ(γ0)/Γ (=I(γO)/ΣI(γ) in the case of bound states) should be used where available to deduce the level width (or T1/2). When J and W are known. For the inelastic case, the corresponding intensity ratio I(γi)/ΣI(γ) would be needed.

Note I: Measurements are usually done at 127° where W=1 for all dipole transitions. independent of Jo. J. or Ji (P2(θ)=O at this angle). For mixed transitions. W depends on the mixing ratio and on the J's.

Note 2: Occasionally, self-absorption experiments are performed. These can yield the quantity gWΓ(γo)/Γ.

The quantity $\Gamma(\gamma o)^2/\Gamma$ can be given in the “S" field, with the field suitably relabelled (see G. 1. below). This procedure is convenient since it eliminates considerable typing work at the input stage. The quantity Γ(γo)/Γ

can be given in the RI field for the relevant γ or as a comment on the corresponding level.

9. BEλ and βλ

In Coulomb excitation and (e,e'), where electromagnetic excitation probabilities can be determined, the quantities BE2, BE3, etc. , should be quoted on continuation level records. Data quoted as matrix elements should be converted to BE2 etc. The fact that a matrix element had been determined could be added as a comment. Note that $BE\lambda=(2Jo+I)^{-1}|<ME\lambda>|^2$, where <MEλ> is the matrix element and Jo is the target spin.

> Note: Do not give BEλ data with the gammas. BEλ(down) data, given by an author for gammas, should be converted to BEλ(up) and given with the corresponding level. The appropriate place for BEλ(down) data is in adopted gammas where we give such values in single-particle units based on adopted T1/2, branching, etc., data.

In inelastic reactions other than those governed by the electromagnetic interaction, the appropriate interaction strengths to quote are the deformation parameters, βλ or βλR. Authors sometimes convert the deformation parameters to BEλ, but this is a model-dependent procedure and unless the authors quote only BEλ the deformation parameters are what should be entered into ENSDF.

10. Delayed gammas.

For an in-beam reaction in which both prompt and delayed Iγ from level X are available, there are two methods of accounting for the data.
a) If only one reaction (or more than one but grouped together such as in (HI,xnγ) contains data on the delayed transitions from level X, then two data sets can be created, one labelled with the modifier "prompt gammas" and the other with the modifier "delayed gammas".

b) The preferred method is to create an IT decay data set for level x. This alternative is especially recommended if there is more than one source of data. In this case a single IT data set which combines the results from all the relevant reactions is preferable to creating several delayed-gammas data sets from the several reactions for the same level X.

Note: The prompt data should of course always be included; however, the separation into prompt and delayed data sets can be particularly useful when the delayed-gamma intensities are used to obtain multipolarities based on intensity balance arguments.

If the delayed data are rather sparse, and the results from the data, such as multipolarity information, or T1/2, can be conveniently quoted in the prompt data set, for example "Mult: from α deduced from intensity balance in the delayed spectrum", then the evaluator may choose to combine all the data in a single data set.

11. Separate data sets for reactions studied, but for which no specific level information is given, can be included at the evaluator's discretion if the experiment yielded some useful information. Such a data set would consist

only of comments. The following are examples.

208Po from 204Pb(160,12C) 76Da18

E-93 MeV
The authors deduce Γ(α) for the 208Po ground state and compare it with the corresponding α-decay value via R-matrix theory using the same target-plus-α nuclear potential.

208Pb from 208Pb(p,n) 74ScOl,74Sc3l

E-25.8 MeV
Authors deduce rms neutron/proton radius ratio=l.O7 3

> Note: In many cases the information contained in such data sets could also be included as comments in adopted levels. This is especially true for the second example; however, unless a data set is created for a reaction, there is no convenient way to search and retrieve that reaction and thus to indicate to the reader that such a reaction was studied. If a reaction was studied but no "useful" information is available, then it would be appropriate to simply list the reaction under "Other reactions" in a comment in adopted levels.

12. β- and ε+β+ feedings and Logft

Logft values should be made consistent with the deduced β- or ε+β+ feedings. In particular, when I±ΔI is consistent with zero, for example 3% 3 the corresponding logft should be expressed as a lower limit corresponding to a feeding of I+ΔI(6% in this case). Branches that overlap zero, for example,-3% 6, should be shown with the feeding given as an upper limit, in this case <3%, with the corresponding logft given as a lower limit.

> Note 1: The above holds for cases where the feeding can be expected to be non-negligible, that is, where the transition is ΔJ=l, Δπ=yes or no, or ΔJ=2, Δπ=yes. In cases where the Jπ change implies negligible feeding, the feeding should be set to zero. Any deduced feeding not consistent with zero should be commented on and an explanation for the inconsistency given if possible.
>
> An exception to this policy of omitting "unphysical" branches occurs when the initial or final Jπ is in question and it is not clear whether it is the Jπ or the feeding that is in error. In such a case, the β- or ε+β+ branch should be shown, perhaps with a "?", and the problem should be pointed out in a comment.
>
> Note 2: The summed feeding to two levels connected by a transition whose TI is not known, or is known only as a limit, can sometimes be determined even though the feeding cannot be divided between the two levels. Such combined feedings should be given in a comment.

13. Normalization

The normalization condition should always be given. Be sure to account for both NR and BR.

Note 1: If the normalization condition involves a measured quantity for which no uncertainty is quoted by the authors, for example, I(β- gs)=30%, try to assign an uncertainty. If you can not do so, or choose not to do so, then the resulting NR (or NRxBR) should be given as approximate. If NR is given with no uncertainty, note that GTOL will generate level feedings, and MEDLIST will generate absolute intensities, that reflect only the uncertainties in the relative intensities. In the example given, if ΔI(β-) is assigned, the uncertainty can be explicitly added to the I(β-) in the listing, with an appropriate comment, or simply referred to in the normalization statement, for example "NR:...The evaluator has assigned an uncertainty of x% to the intensity of the gs β- branch in order to get an overall uncertainty for NR". The former approach is recommended. Note that when the gs branch has a small intensity, say a few percent, then even a large assigned uncertainty can result in a rather precise NR as calculated from ΣTI(gs)=1OO-Iβ-(gs).

Note 2: In a case where the I7 in the RI field already include all the uncertainty appropriate for absolute intensities, such as when an author determines and quotes absolute values (including absolute uncertainties), then the NR and BR should introduce no additional uncertainty and so should be given on the "N" record with no uncertainty (there is no requirement that the uncertainty in BR, as given in adopted levels, be carried over to the "N" record in a decay data set, although the value itself of course must be the same).

14. Parent records

In the parent record, the fields where data are known should be filled in, and the data should be the same as in the adopted data set. Comments on the "P" record should not be given unless necessary. The appropriate place for comments on any of the quantities appearing on the "P" record is in the adopted data set for the parent nuclide.

Note: Since the "P" record itself is not listed in the output, the comments on these data appear "dangling"," that is, the value of the quantity being referred does not appear along with the comment. If it is necessary to introduce a comment on the "P" record, then it must be worded in such a way that it is "self-contained".

15. Miscellaneous

a) The symbol "/" should not be used when proportionality of more than two values is being expressed. The expression KILIM is mathematically equivalent to KM/L, even though few readers would interpret it that way. Use ":" instead, thus K:L:M.

b) Do not replace numerical values with large uncertainties by approximate values.

Note: An "isomer" energy of 230300 allows for the possibility that the isomer may lie below the "ground state" by 70 keV. If the energy is replaced by z230, this possibility, while of course not ruled out, will not be conveyed to most readers.

c) Try to resolve discrepancies. If they cannot be resolved, then at least state this fact.

Note: If δ=+0.38, say, is adopted for a certain transition and the value δ=+2 appears in one of the source data sets, then, if the reason for the discrepancy cannot be determined, the evaluator should at least comment on the discrepancy. This can be done in the source data set, where it could be pointed out that the value differs from the adopted value, or in adopted γ's, where the discrepant value could be mentioned in a comment. If something like this is not done, the reader might think that the discrepant value had been overlooked and might thus question the adopted value. If there are several such "discrepant" δ values in a certain data set, a general comment rather than a comment on each case could be given.

d) Use the word "uncertainty" rather than "error" to refer to what we call the standard deviation in a measured quantity. The word "error" should be reserved for mistakes, such as in the sentence "The authors apparently made an error when they ...".

e) Note that TI is translated as I(γ+ce), not I(ε+β+) even though the fields have the same name in ENSDF. When I(ε+β+) is what is meant, it must be spelled out.

f) A level designated as an isomer in one data set should be treated as an isomer in all data sets (that is, columns 78 and/or 79 should be filled in) .

g) Do not comment on correction factors for a quantity when such correction factors are negligible relative to the uncertainty quoted for the quantity. For example, μ=+3.8 5 does not require a comment stating "The diamagnetic correction has not been applied".

h) Avoid the use of "CA" in the uncertainty field when a numeric uncertainty can be calculated.

Note: If Iγ is calculated from TI and a, the uncertainty in Iγ (from the uncertainty in TI and α), rather than "CA", should be put in the uncertainty field.

i) When calculating or correcting quantities that depend on other properties, for example calculating conversion coefficients which depend on Eγ, calculating T1/2 from BE2 which depends on Eγ, branching, δ, and α, or correcting g factors for their dependence on T1/2, adopted values of all relevant quantities should be used.

j) When working with an author's proposed decay scheme, the evaluator should make a search for possible alternate gamma placements between known levels.

k) Enter data in the E(ε) or E(β-) fields only when they are of sufficient accuracy that in the evaluator's judgement they should be considered as input to the mass adjustment. Values which are of somewhat less accuracy, but still "significant", could be mentioned in comments. Very imprecise values are probably not worth giving. All the network analysis programs that require these energies obtain them from the appropriate Q value and level energy.

Note: A measurement of a β+ endpoint must be entered as E(ε)=E(β+)+2mc^2. A comment such as "E(ε): From E(β+)=...(keynumber)", for example, would be appropriate.

l) In alpha-decay data sets, if the energies of the daughter levels being fed are not known, the E(level)=O+X style should be used rather than listing the alphas as unplaced. With this procedure, relative level energies can be presented in the daughter-nucleus mass chain. Alternatively, a systematics level energy can be given (see **C**. c) below). Note that there is no such thing as an unplaced alpha, unless one is referring to an alpha whose parent assignment is uncertain.

m) Measurements of $P_k\omega_k$ (=I(K x ray)) should be given. Adopted values scan be entered on a continuation "E" record. These quantities are of direct interest to some researchers and of course they provide a direct measurement of the K x rays, either for ε branches to individual levels, or an average for the whole decay scheme, depending on the case. When possible, the $P_k\omega_k$ should be compared with the I(K x ray) as calculated by MEDLIST.

n) If numerical data are quoted in comments, the uncertainty should be included unless the value is being used only as a label, thus "T1/2: From BE2=0.240 6", or "μ: From g=1.62 3 in (α,2nγ)". This is not to imply that the actual numerical value is needed in all cross references, but only that if quoted, the uncertainty should be included.

0) When changing the sign of a mixing ratio which has an asymmetric uncertainty, note that δ=A +a-b becomes δ=-A +b-a, not -A +a-b.

p) The ground state should be included in all data sets of the type (X,X'), that is, inelastic scattering.

C. **Systematics**

Use should be made of systematics whenever possible, the extent to which they can be applied in any given case being determined by how reliable theyare. The evaluator is usually in a better position to know how and when to apply systematics of a given quantity than the typical reader who is generally looking at just one, or perhaps a few, mass chains at a time.

> Note: The network evaluators already make extensive use of systematics. The strong arguments for Jπ assignments which rely on logft's, the strong arguments for multipolarities which rely on RUL, and extrapolations from the measured data in the mass adjustment (which are in fact called systematics values) are perhaps the prime examples.

One area in which systematics are particularly valuable is in the estimation of ground state and isomeric state branching ratios.

> a) Plots of Log T1/2(α) vs log E(α) for nuclides with the same Z are usually linear. For a nuclide whose alpha branching has not been experimentally determined, the use of the T1/2(α) vs E(α) systematics can sometimes yield a reliable estimate of T1/2(α) which, along with the measured total T1/2, then yields the alpha branching. On more than one occasion, such as estimate has been invoked to show that an experimental value must be incorrect. See also c) below.
>
> b) The gross beta decay T1/2(β-) and T1/2(ε+β+) estimates from, for example
> K. Takahashi, et al., Beta-Decay Half-lives Calculated on the Gross Theory, Atomic Data and Nuclear Data Tables 12, 101 (1973), can be used to estimate β- or ε+β+ branching fractions. These estimates are considered to be reliable to better than a factor of about 3; thus, while an estimate of %β-≈50, and thus branching for the alternate modes ≈50%, should be considered as very approximate, an estimate of %β-≈0.1 can be used to assign the alternate mode(s) as essentially 100% with a high degree of reliability.

Additional areas where systematics arguments should at least be explored include the following.

> c) Systematics of alpha-decay hindrance factors can be used to deduce a variety of quantities (depending on what is known about the decay branch). These include Jπ and configurations, total alpha branching and branchings of individual groups, and the excitation energy of the level fed in the daughter nucleus. Each evaluator (or center) responsible for a mass region in which alpha decay occurs is encouraged to build up such a set of systematics. See M. R. Schmorak, Systematics of Nuclear Level Properties in the Lead Region, Nuclear Data Sheets 31, 283 (1980), and M. R. Schmorak, α-Decay Hindrance Factors, in the ENSDF procedures manual for a further discussion of these and other types of systematics.
>
> d) In cases where a certain pair of shell-model or Nilsson-model orbitals gives rise to the appearance of a certain isomeric transition over a reasonably large mass range, the reduced transition probabilities for the isomeric transition usually fall

within a narrow range of values. Such values can be used to estimate properties for the "same" transition where one piece of information, such as T1/2, IT branching, or Eγ, is missing.

e) In a case where a ground-state β- branch is not known, and there is no other way to determine the gamma normalization, it might be possible to build up local systematics of logft values for similar transitions. Even if the evaluator decides not to give an explicit normalization factor, a comment pointing out what this factor would be if the transition had a logft value similar to other such transitions in the same region would be of value to the reader.

Note: From $\log f^{lu}t > 8.5$ one might get Iβ-(gs)<lO%. While this estimate might be the best one can do, in some cases systematics of $\log f^{lu}t$ values for other transitions of similar type (that is, transitions between similar configurations) might suggest that the probable intensity is <5%, or even close to zero. In such cases the evaluator can adopt the systematics value for the limit on the β- feeding for the purpose of obtaining the normalization. The justification for the value chosen must of course be stated. The systematics value could also be entered directly in the Iβ field, with the explanation for the source of that value given there instead of with (or in addition to) the normalization factor.

D. Uncertainties

1. Estimation of uncertainties.

When an experimental value is quoted by an author without an uncertainty, the evaluator should attempt to estimate and assign an uncertainty to that quantity if the Quantity is needed as Dart of a further calculation. or if that value is of a auantitv that needs to be adoDted and no other value is available.

> Note 1: The normalization of a decay scheme may sometimes involve a measurement quoted with no uncertainty. See Note 1 under **B**. 13. above for a discussion of the case where a ground-state beta transition, with no quoted uncertainty, is needed for the decay scheme normalization.
>
> Note 2: When one or more excitation energies in a reaction data set, quoted with no uncertainty, need to be included in adopted levels, the evaluator should attempt to estimate the uncertainty for these excitation energies. The uncertainty can sometimes be estimated by comparing the author's values with adopted energies in regions where there is overlap. Occasionally, comparison with data for other nuclei also included in the paper can be helpful.

2. Adoption of uncertainties

The weighted average program, GTOL, and all other analysis programs that calculate uncertainties when individual values with uncertainties are combined, treat the individual uncertainties as statistical in nature. When the uncertainties are known to have a significant systematic component, the output from the above programs should be modified as necessary. In particular, in cases where it is clear that the quoted uncertainty is mainly systematic, say due to a calibration uncertainty, the adopted uncertainty should be no smaller than the smallest of the input uncertainties. No result obtained from a weighted or unweighted average program or by any other method can have an uncertainty smaller than the uncertainty(ies) in the calibration standard(s) used to determine the input values.

3. All uncertainties in extracted data, for example Eγ, Iγ, E(level), T1/2, should be accounted for, either explicitly or in comments. Authors occasionally quote peak-fitting uncertainties and then state in a comment that an additional x% should be included to account for other sources of uncertainty, or they quote the value for some quantity relative to a standard value.

> Note I: In the case of Iγ, these additional uncertainties, if independent of Eγ or Iγ, can either be included in NR, or explicitly combined, for each transition, with the partial uncertainties given by the authors. Since the intensity ratios of transitions close in energy may be nearly independent of the additional uncertainties, there may be an advantage to accounting for these through inclusion in NR, although of course additional uncertainties that have been folded in can always be folded out, if necessary.
>
> Note 2: In the case of data on other quantities, the additional uncertainties should be included explicitly, at least for quantities

that are used in adopted levels, gammas. None of the network analysis or listing programs are capable of making use of a comment such as "An additional uncertainty of x eV should be added in quadrature to the Eγ to account for uncertainties in the calibration". If an author quotes a value of, say, T1/2 or a g factor relative to a standard, the uncertainty in the standard should be included when the value is adopted or combined with other measurements.

4. For calculational purposes, and when doing a calculation "by hand", the evaluator should attach an uncertainty to all theoretical a's. (3% is recommended). For example, calculations of TI=Iγ(l+α) (or Iγ=TI/(l+α) , or T1/2 from BE2 should include this uncertainty. In many cases the contribution of this uncertainty to the total uncertainty is negligible, but, for example, in normalizing a 100% IT decay to Iγ(l+α)=100, or normalizing a decay scheme in which only a single transition feeds the ground state and the Iγ for this transition is given by the authors with no uncertainty, the uncertainty in a will be the only uncertainty in the normalized Iγ (assuming that the decay scheme is certain). A comment should be included to explain what was done. This uncertainty should not be entered in the Δα field. Our analysis programs already assign a 3% uncertainty to the a when performing calculations involving this quantity.

5. Uncertainties larger than 25 should, in general, be rounded off.

Note: Data should be quoted in units such that this round-off convention can be applied. For example, T1/2=250 ps 50 should be quoted as 0.25 ns 5, and a set of Iγ data given by an author normalized to Iγi=lOOO 70 should be renormalized to Iγi=100 7. In the case of energies, since our standard unit is keV, values such as Q-=2000 150, or E(β-)=2450 80 do not have to be converted to 2.00 15 MeV, 2.458 MeV, etc.

E. Resonances

In general, the data coverage in ENSDF is limited to the bound-state region; however, any properties of the bound levels deduced from resonance work should be included. In particular, Eγ and 1γ data from (p,γ) and (n,γ) do not need to be included in ENSDF except as noted below.

Note: A typical case of interest is one in which average resonance neutron capture has been studied, and Jπ values, deduced on the basis of reduced transition intensities, are given. For such cases, the data set needs to contain only the bound levels fed from the resonances, along with the deduced Jπ values. The Iγ themselves, typically presented as $I\gamma/E\gamma^5$, are not required. In fact it is recommended that they not be given since they are just average quantities and are significant from the point of view of ENSDF only for their use in deducing Jπ (in this sense, they are analogous to angular distribution coefficients, for example).

Resonance data should be included in the following cases.

a) Isobaric analog resonance data should be included. They should also be included in adopted levels.

b) Giant resonance data should be included although data of this type

are available for only a few nuclides.

c) Eγ, Iγ (and other relevant data) from thermal neutron capture should be included.

Note: For isobaric analog resonances, the excitation data should appear in the nucleus in which the resonances occur. Branchings to daughter levels, for example in (p,np'), should be given. Comments giving the deduced energies of the parent states (that is, energies relative to E=0 for the analog of the ground state), or comments labelling the resonance with the appropriate parent level, are useful.

Other situations may arise where the inclusion of resonance data is important, for example near closed shells where the resonances occur at excitation energies lowenough that they may "overlap" adjacent studied bound states. The inclusion of data in this and other special cases is at the evaluator's discretion.

Note: Energies for resonance data can be entered in the form SN+X, SP+X, where X is the neutron- or proton-resonance energy, usually given in lab units (but whether lab or c.m. coordinate should be specified in either case). In adopted levels, these resonances should be converted to excitation energies.

F. L Transfers

1. A brief comment on the method used for obtaining the L values should be given. It is important to distinguish between, for example, L values "from DWBA analysis", and L values "From comparison of σ(θ) with shapes for levels with known Jπ".

2. Parentheses are used to denote questionable or uncertain values. As described in the new introductory section, square brackets can now be used to indicate an assumed value, that is, a value adopted by an experimenter (or by an evaluator) on the basis of known Jπ. This might be done for the purpose of extracting S, or for determining empirical angular distribution shapes so that L values for other levels can be determined.

Note: In quoting L values, the evaluator has the option of quoting the author's values and then applying his/her own judgement as to their reliability when incorporating them into Jπ assignments, or of quoting the author's values as modified by the evaluator. For example, an author's L=2 which in the evaluator's judgement should be L=(2), could appear as L=2 in the source data set, but as L=(2) if used as a J1I' argument. Alternatively, it could be entered as L=(2) in the source data set. In either case, a comment is needed explaining that the evaluator feels that the L assignment is tentative.

G. Spectroscopic Factors

1. The exact label for the quantity given should be defined by using the "LABEL=name" format described in the manual; thus, "LABEL=C2S".

2. It is recommended that an explicit definition of S be given if there is any ambiguity about what is meant; thus "S is defined by

dσ/dΩ(exp)=Nsdσ/dΩ(DWBA) with N=..."

3. The method for obtaining the scale of S should be given. It is important to distinguish between absolute and relative values; thus, a comment such as "From DWBA", which implies that the values are "absolute" , or "From DWBA normalized to X for the y level" for relative S values, should be given.

4. The shell-model (or other) orbital involved in the transfer should be specified if needed for the extraction of S.

> Note: This can usually be done with a general comment such as "L-l, 2, and 3 are assumed to be P3/2, d5/2, and f5/2 except where noted otherwise". An alternative method is to give Jπ for the relevant levels along with a comment such as "Jπ: Value assumed by the authors for the extraction of S". The former approach is preferred when practical.

5. In cases where the Jπ adopted by an author differs from the evaluator's adopted value, the S value, which will thus be incorrect, should not be entered in the S field but given only in a comment. The reason for recommending that the incorrect value be given at all, is that a knowledgeable reader can often estimate from the value calculated for the incorrect orbital what the value for the correct orbital will be.

H. Jπ

1. For decay data sets, Jπ values from adopted levels should be included where known. The new introductory section states that this is our standard policy. For reaction data sets with no gammas, it is recommended that Jπ values not be given unless they are determined in the reaction in question, or unless theyare important in explaining some other aspect of the experiment. In reaction data sets with gammas, it is recommended that adopted Jπ values be given. Note that the new introductory section states that Jπ values appearing in γ reaction data set are adopted values unless noted otherwise.

> Note 1: For reactions that do not involve gammas, Jπ values determined in that reaction, such as from L values and analyzing powers in a (d,p) reaction, should be given in the Jπ field along with a comment stating how they were determined. Jπ values that come directly from the L values, such as J=L±1/2 for single-particle transfer on an even-even nucleus, or L=J in (p,t) on an even-even target, are redundant, and should not routinely be given. Exceptions occur, for example, where the evaluator wishes to indicate the Jπ value used to extract the spectroscopic factor, or to explicitly show the band structure.
>
> Note 2: For reactions involving gammas, for example average resonance neutron capture, the deduced Jπ values can be given in the Jπ field, or in comments. The latter procedure is recommended since adopted Jπ can then be put in the Jπ field, in line with our recommended policy of including adopted Jπ values for any reaction data set involving gammas.

2. Arguments used in the Jπ assignments in adopted levels must be documented in the source data sets. The following are just a few examples.

Jπ	**argument**

a)	3/2-	L(d,p)=l, 392γ to 5/2- is Ml
b)	1-	Av. Res. (n,γ). γ to 0+
c)	3+	El γ to 2-. γγ(θ)
d)	(5/2)+	L=2, C2S in (d,p)

In a), the (d,p) data set should contain the L value referred to, with any explanation deemed necessary to justify or explain it. The adopted γ's data set should contain the justification for the Ml assignment to the 392γ.

In b), the Av. Res. (n,γ) data set should contain the value deduced in that data set (Jπ=0-,l- in the present case, given either in the Jπ field, or in a comment. See Note 3 under 1. above.

In c), enough details on the γγ(θ) experiment should be given in the source data set to justify the conclusions. Briefly, this section should mention the assumptions, that is, what J's for other levels and what δ's for relevant gammas in the cascade were adopted, and should clearly state which values of J are allowed and which are ruled out. In the above example, it is only necessary to state that γγ(θ) is consistent with J=3, and rules out J=l and 2.

In d), the (d,p) data set should contain the L and C2S values for the level in question, and a comment justifying the basis for the C2S argument. For example, "d3/2 strength exhausted by known 3/2+ levels. C2S for the L=2, E=...level suggests d5/2".

I. Iγ, TI

1. Relative 11 data (or absolute, for example in (n,γ), in preference to branching ratio data, should be given when available.

> Note: If both relative Iγ and branching ratios are available, and if the branching ratios are more accurately known than the relative 11, then both should be given. The relative Iγ should be given in the RI field, and the branching ratios can be given as comments on the relevant levels.

2. For reaction γ's, the projectile energy and the angle at which the quoted Iγ were measured should be specified unless obvious from the keywords given in general comments. Relative Iγ values measured under different experimental conditions, such as at a different bombarding energy or angle, should not be combined in the RI field except where an Iγ from level "X" is deduced from branchings relative to other transitions from level "X".

3. Gamma intensities reported as upper limits are important data measurements and should be included. A comment to the effect that the transition was not seen could be included. An Iγ given as "weak" by an author should be so noted in a comment. It is important to distinguish, for example, between the cases where a missing Iγ is weak and where it is obscured by an impurity (and thus could be strong).

> Note: In principle, one could distinguish between observed and unobserved transitions expressed as limits by the use of "≤" for the former, and "<" for the latter; however, the distinction between these

two non-numeric uncertainties is not universally agreed upon and in any event is probably too subtle a distinction.

4. The TI field should be used only if TI, rather than Iγ, is the quantity measured or deduced. Two common cases where this occurs are where TI is deduced from intensity-balance arguments, or where TI given by summing the I(ce). When TI is given, then if α is known, the corresponding Iγ should be calculated and entered into the Iγ field, unless the value is negligibly small. The uncertainty given for Iγ should include that in both TI and α. A comment should then be given stating that the Iγ comes from TI and α.

Note 1: An Iγ deduced from TI and α may be given in the RI field even when a direct measurement of Iγ is available if the evaluator concludes that the deduced value is more reliable than the measured value.

Note 2: When TI, rather than Iγ, is the basic measured or deduced quantity, then the K/T(=αk/(l+α))=... etc. , rather than the αk-..., etc., format on the continuation record should be used. K/T, for example, operates directly on TI to generate the cek intensity (via MEDLIST) and the resulting x ray intensities. This format avoids including some uncertainties twice, since Iγ, if calculated from TI and α, will already have an uncertainty combined from these two quantities.

5. Do not put TI values in the RI field, even if a comment is included to explain what is being done, and even if all the entries are TI values. It is especially important to avoid mixing RI and TI in the same field.

6. The RI (or TI) field should be left blank for a transition which deexcites a daughter nucleus isomer whose T1/2 value is such that the intensity is time-dependent. A computer retrievable comment should be included giving the % feeding of the isomer, and a comment is also needed explaining why the intensity is missing.

7. I(x ray) and I(γ±) data, where of good quality, should be given as comments. It is recommended that they be given in the form I(x ray)/Iγ(γi), where γi is the transition to which the γ's are normalized. This procedure avoids the necessity of changing the comments if the Iγ are renormalized. It is recommended that the program MEDLIST be run to compare the measured x ray and γ± intensities with those calculated on the basis of the adopted decay scheme. If the I(x ray))/Iγ or I(γ±)/Iγ measurements are needed to get the decay scheme normalization, note that MEDLIST can be used in an iterative fashion to deduce NR.

8. Internal conversion intensities are not needed and it is recommended that they not be given except in the following cases.

a) I(ce) ratios measured to a precision of better than about 3% should be included. At this level of precision it is useful to compare such values to the theoretical values.

b) Where no Iγ is given, or where the I(ce) are more precise, the I(ce) values should be quoted.

c) I(ce) are needed for EO transitions, and should also be given for

anomalously converted transitions.

9. It is recommended that a limit on a transition intensity, I<A, be converted to I=1/2A±1/2A for the purpose of calculating quantities that require the intensity of this transition, such as normalization factors, β- and ε+β+ feedings, or branchings. For branchings, see Note 4 under **G**. in GUIDELINES FOR ADOPTED LEVELS , GAMMAS .

Note 1 : In a situation where Iβ-(gs) is determined to be <6%, and the evaluator has no further information to suggest, for example, that this value should be closer to 0 than to 6, the intensity should be expressed as 3% 3 for the purpose of obtaining the gamma intensity normalization, that is, one should set sum TI(gs)=97 3 and explain what is being done. This procedure is preferable to any of the alternatives, namely setting ΣTI(gs)=lOO, or ΣTI(gs)>97. There is no justification for adopting the first alternative, and adopting the second alternative leads to lower limits being given for all the intensities. The usefulness of the procedure depends of course on the value of the limit itself. If I(β-) is known only to be <50%, then perhaps it is not worthwhile normalizing the decay scheme, although setting sum TI(gs)-75% 25 is still perhaps better than doing nothing (if no normalization is adopted, a comment could be given stating what the normalization factor would be for the extreme cases, namely for Iβ-=0, and Iβ-=50). Note that the intensity of the gs β- group should still be given as a limit in the β- listing.

Note 2: Iγ values given as limits should be converted to 1/2Iγ±1/2Iγ for the purpose of obtaining β- and/or ε feedings from intensity imbalances. This procedure may lead to some fee dings with rather large uncertainties, but that correctly reflects the state of knowledge of the decay scheme. This procedure is analogous to setting mult=[Ml+E2] for a highly converted transition in order to estimate its total intensity. Again, there is no implied suggestion that the intensities themselves should be changed from their limit form in the Iγ field. The program GTOL will be modified so that it automatically treats limits in this fashion.

If the evaluator feels that the limit in a given case should not be treated in this fashion, then a comment should be given justifying whatever approach is taken.

10. For the purpose of obtaining β and/or ε feedings, gamma transitions whose placements are uncertain (that is, transitions that have a "?" in column 80) should be handled in the same manner as for transitions given as limits discussed in Note 2 under 10. above. That is, one should take Iγ=ΔIγ=1/2(A+ΔA), where Iγ=A±ΔA is the measured value. GTOL will be modified to treat uncertain transitions in this manner, but until this is done, the evaluator will be responsible for seeing that the input to GTOL is modified as discussed here.

J. Mult, δ, α

I. As stated in the new introductory section, the multipolarity and δ entries (and thus α) for decay data sets should be adopted values. The inclusion of such data is mandatory. In reaction gamma data sets such information should be included as needed or if measured.

Note: In many reaction data sets, the TI are not needed. In such cases the δ and α are not needed; however, the mult should be given. If the TI needed, then adopted values for mult and δ should be used.

2. In any data set in which multipolarity and/or δ values are determined, the basis for such determinations should be stated. The sources of mult data used by the evaluator, such as γ(θ), αk, along with the normalization required in the case of αk data determined from relative Iγ and I(cek), should be given whether or not the exDerimental data. such as A2 and A4, αk. etc. .are explicitly given. Multipolarity assignments from ce data should be those of the evaluator based on the output from HSICC. Multipolarities deduced by the authors (or by the evaluator) on the basis of γ(θ) to be "stretched" should be so noted in a comment. The style "ΔJ=1, or ΔJ=2", etc. is recommended.

Note I: In general, γ(θ) data determine only the L component of the gamma character, thus mult=D, D+Q, etc. Further assumptions are needed to establish the change in π. These assumptions should be stated when D is converted to M1, or D+Q to M1+E2, etc. In particular, Q=E2 should not be considered an "obvious" conclusion. If T1/2 is known, RUL can sometimes be invoked to rule out some choices, in particular Q=M2, and D+Q=E1+M2 when δ is known. If known Jπ's are used to establish any part of a gamma's character, then that part should be put in parentheses. Keep in mind that one of the implied uses of a non-parenthesized mult is as a strong argument to assign Jπ values, so one must avoid circularity.

Note 2: If any mult=D, D+Q, etc. can be assigned as MI, MI+E2, etc. only by the use of level scheme arguments, then it is recommended that the designation mult=D, for example, be retained in the source data set unless the complete designation, mult=(MI), is actually needed, for example to get a. The mult=(MI) assignment can be made when choosing mult for the adopted γ's section. The main advantage to following this procedure, other than the general caution that assumptions should be made onlv when necessar, is that the fact that a transition is known to have mult=D (strong assignment) may be more useful in assigning a Jπ value than having only the parenthesized mult=(MI) (weak assignment) at one's disposal. When such an argument is used, then of course the reference for the mult should be to the source data set, and not to adopted γ's if the adopted value is mult=(MI).

3. The entries in the mult, δ and α fields should be mutually consistent. In particular, the following guidelines should be followed.

a) If a single multipolarity is adopted, the δ field should be blank.

b) If only a limit on δ is available, and this limit is significant and worth giving, then there are two options.

i) Give the dominant multipolarity, with corresponding α, and give the δ limit in a comment.

ii) Give both multipolarities and give the 6 limit in the δ field.

In this case, α should be the value corresponding to 1/2δ(max) with an uncertainty chosen to overlap the 0 to δ(max) range.

Note: Option i) is recommended when, in the evaluator's judgement, the admixed component is likely to be smaller than the experimental limit; thus, E2+M3 with δ<0.5 should probably be entered as E2, while MI+E2 with δ<0.5 should probably be retained as a mixed multipolarity entry.

c) If two multipolarities are given but no δ is known, the corresponding α value should be the value calculated as in 7. a) below.

d) If the mult field contains more than two multipolarities, for example, E0+MI+E2, the E2/MI, or E2/E0 etc., mixing ratios, if known, should be given on a continuation record rather than in the δ field.

e) If δ overlaps zero or infinity, the corresponding multipolarity component should be in parentheses. For δ values whose experimental limit does not overlap zero or infinity, the evaluator may still choose to adopt the corresponding component in parentheses if he/she feels that the difference from zero or infinity is not significant (this is equivalent to interpreting the author's uncertainty as being somewhat larger than quoted).

4. The mixing ratio notation, MI+x%E2, occasionally used by authors should be converted to δ.

5. Mult=MI,E2 is not equivalent to mult=MI+E2. The first designation refers to the case where the experimental data overlap the theoretical values for both multipolarities. The second designation refers to the situation where the experimental data lie between the theoretical values for the two multipolarities. The designation M1(+E2) is an intermediate case where the experimental data overlap the M1 theory but not the E2 theory value.

6. If αk, etc. data, or conclusions from such data, are given, the bases for the values used should be given. If from relative I(ce) and 1γ, the basis for the normalization of the relative scales should be stated. Be sure that the mult for any transition used in this scale normalization is independently established.

7. In cases where internal conversion is significant but the multipolarity is not known (apart from level scheme considerations), and TI is otherwise unobtainable and needed, the following procedures can be followed.

a) If ΔJ, Δπ are known, one can enter mult=[MI], [EI+M2], etc. , in the mult field and choose α accordingly. If mult=[MI+E2], for example, one should enter $\alpha=1/2[\alpha(MI)+\alpha(E2)]$ and $\Delta\alpha=|\alpha-\alpha(M1)|-|\alpha-\alpha(E2)|$.

b) If ΔJ and/or Δπ are not known, one can still follow the procedure described in a) and set, for example, mult=[D,E2] (or mult=[E1,M1,E2]). Mult=M2 or higher are assumed here to be less probable, but of course could be included.

The usefulness of either a) or b) depends of course on the range of a values for the possible multipolarities.

> Note I: If $\Delta J=l$, $\Delta\pi$=no, mult=[MI+E2] should be adopted rather than Mult=[MI] or mult=(E2] , unless there are good arguments for believing that one of the two possible multipole components dominates. α from MI+E2 is always "correct", although it may have a large uncertainty, whereas α(M1), for example, may lead to misleading conclusions. The possible large uncertainty in a for M1+E2 when δ is not known, correctly reflects the state of knowledge concerning the total intensities.
>
> Note 2: The use of the mult=[ ] convention should be restricted to cases r-', where the internal conversion is significant for the purpose at hand. In particular, do not assign mult=[ ] simply because the mult can be deduced from the level scheme. See also F. 5. in GUIDELINES FOR ADOPTED LEVELS, GAMMAS below.

8. The experimental αk, etc., as well as ce ratios, that are used to determine multipolarities can be given at the evaluators discretion; however, values measured with a precision of better than about 3% should be given, as well as values for transitions within 2 keV of the binding energy (and thus outside the range of values given by Hager and Seltzer). Except in these cases, it is sufficient to state, for example, that "Mult and 6 are from αk(exp) calculated from relative Iγ, and I(ce) normalized so that ..." except that it is important to point out where conversion electron intensity ratios rather than just αk have been used, since, as is well known, αk data by themselves do not always uniquely define a single multipolarity, or combination of multipolarities. The references used as sources for the I(ce) data must be given, either in the footnote explaining the source for the mult and δ, or in the general comments.

9. Note the distinction between ( ) and [ ] for multipolarities. These are discussed in the new introductory material. Parentheses are used when there is some experimental data, but the data are not conclusive. The square brackets are used to denote a value deduced solely from level scheme considerations. Note, in particular, that for the case where $\gamma(\theta)$ determines mult=D+Q and the level scheme is used to assign M1+E2 rather than E1+M2, then the mult should be in parentheses, that is, mult=(M1+E2) with a comment stating something like "Mult: D+Q from $\gamma(\theta)$ in ... $\Delta\pi$=no from the level scheme". Square brackets are not appropriate for this case, since the level scheme argument forms only part of the assignment.

10. Do not show α as a lower limit. The quantity Iγ(l+α) could then appear incorrectly as a lower limit whereas there of course must be an upper bound. The situation arises almost exclusively in connection with transitions that have an E0 component in their multipolarity. The basic data are usually a measured I(cek) and an upper limit on Iγ which lead to TI=I(ce)+<Iγ, where I(ce)=Σ_i(cei). That is, TI has an upper bound. The recommended way to handle this situation is to give I(cek) in a comment, along with the Iγ limit in the RI field. TI should be also be given, and αk can be given in a comment. For a transition adopted as pure E0, then ofcourse only TI=I(ce) will be filled in.

> Note: The recommended procedure for obtaining TI will depend on the

relative magnitude of I(ce) and the Iγ limit. For I(ce)>>Iγ, the most useful quantity to quote is TI=I(ce)±1/2Iγ with an uncertainty calculated in the usual way from ΔI(ce) and ΔIγ=1/2Iγ. For I1>>I(ce), TI<[Iγ+I(ce)] is an appropriate choice. For the intermediate case, the first alternative is recommended.

K. g Factors, μ, Q

Values of μ should be taken from 78LeZA/2001StZZ where possible and entered directly
into adopted levels. In such cases, the μ values, or the corresponding values of the g factor, do not need to be repeated in the source data set. Note, however, that if the value of T1/2 used in 78LeZA is different from your adopted value, the value of μ should be corrected for this difference if possible. If it cannot be readily corrected, then a comment should be included giving the T1/2 value to which the μ in 78LeZA corresponds.

More recent g-factor data should be given in the appropriate source data sets with the corresponding value of μ, based on the adopted g factor, given in adopted levels. These values should be corrected, where necessary, for your adopted T1/2. When corrected, a comment such as "g: For T1/2=... The authors report g=... for T1/2=... ". A comment is also needed stating whether or not the diamagnetic and Knight-shift corrections have been applied (if the data are accurate enough to be affected by these corrections). This comment should be given both in the source data sets and in adopted levels.

Similarly, Q values should be taken from 78LeZA/200StZZ where possible and quoted in adopted levels. More recent values should be given in the appropriate source data sets with the adopted value also given in adopted levels. A comment should be given stating whether or not the Sternheimer correction (or some other polarization correction) has been applied if the accuracy of the measured value warrants such a correction.

GUIDELINES FOR ADOPTED LEVELS,GAMMAS DATA SETS

A. General

1. All distinct levels that are observed in any of the individual data sets, and that the evaluator feels are firmly established, should be included in adopted levels. Uncertain levels, that is, levels shown with a "?" in one or more of the individual data sets, can be included or not included at the evaluators discretion. Isobaric analog states (resonances) should be included. Neutron and proton separation energies should not be included.

Note 1: To avoid the introduction of "extraneous" levels, the calibration and general trend of energies compared with adopted values should be checked for each data set. Systematic shifts of energies in one or more data sets should be corrected for when the energies from such data sets are used in obtaining the adopted value, first, to avoid the assignment of level "a" in one reaction as corresponding to level "b" in another reaction based only on the energy difference and, second, to ensure that the energy adopted for, say level "a", if seen in only one reaction, is as correct as possible.

Note 2: When levels from two (or more) reactions lie close in energy (that is, the values agree within the uncertainties) and the evaluator chooses to adopt both (or all) levels, the justification for assuming that the levels are distinct should be given, unless obvious from XREF or other adopted level properties. Consider the following cases.

E=5000 10, Jπ=3/2+ and E=5010 10, Jπ=5/2+ are known from reactions, and E=5005.3 2 is known from a gamma reaction; however, it is not known to which of the two reaction levels this level corresponds and there is no evidence to suggest that it is a separate distinct level. The reaction levels should be adopted, with a comment on each stating that the more accurate value of 5005.32 probably corresponds to one of the two adopted levels. Note that there is no unambiguous way to include the accurate energy as an adopted energy. The evaluator should not adopt three levels, unless there is definite evidence that the gamma-deduced level is distinct from the others.

E-596.7 5 with Jπ=0+,1,2 and E-597.1 3 with Jπ=l+,2,3 are known to be different levels, and l(p,d)=2, leading to Jπ=l-,2-,3- with E=598 2 is also known. Unless there is evidence to suggest that the (p,d) level is distinct, just two levels should be adopted, with a comment on each stating that l(p,d)=2, Jπ=l-,2-,3- for one or both of the levels.

2. Do not unnecessarily adopt values different from those that appear in the literature when the differences are small relative to the quoted uncertainty and if the literature value has been widely quoted in other sources.

Note: Consider a situation in which an author recommends T1/2=6.54 s 22 as
an average from several determinations and this value has subsequently been used by other researchers, and the evaluator determines that the value should be 6.56 s 20. The difference is such that it is not worthwhile introducing a different recommended value into the literature. The slight error in the recommended value should be pointed out (this warning would be useful in case someone recomputes a recommended value on the basis of some new values and relies on the earlier quoted recommendation as a single input value representing the old data).

3. Make use of the XREF entries so that unnecessary comments can be avoided. For example, a comment such as "seen only in (d,p)" is not needed since XREF should already convey that information. An exception could arise, however, if the evaluator wishes to emphasize some doubt about the level. As a second example, the XREF can convey the "one level corresponds to many levels" situation so that comments that convey only this information are not needed. Note, however, that for this second example, comments such as "L(d,p)=l for E=3450", given for two or more adopted levels to which the (d,p) level could correspond, are still needed.

4. Important comments on level properties which appear in source data sets should be repeated in the adopted levels data sets. Comments such as "doublet", "possible contaminant", "not resolved from X", if important in a source data set, are usually just as important in adopted levels.

5. If the evaluator adopts a Q value, say Q-, that is different from the value given in the most recent mass adjustment, the mass adjustment value

should be given in a comment for comparison. If the mass links are not too complicated, it may be possible to adjust the other entries on the Q record to reflect the change in the Q- value. If such is the case, and if the change in Q- is significant, that is, considerably outside the limits given by the mass adjustment, then giving the adjusted S(n), S(p), and Q(α) values would be a valuable contribution. Whether this is done or not, however, is left to the discretion of the evaluator.

> Note: In cases where it is not feasible to attempt a readjustment, a comparison between the mass adjustment value and the adopted value at least allows the reader to judge qualitatively what the effect on the other Q values may be.

6. For gamma records, all available first-card data should be included; however, continuation-record data generated from the HSICC program are not needed.

7. Since the data in adopted levels, gammas are, by definition, the evaluator's recommended values, discreDant data should not be adopted.

> Note 1: If a gamma multipolarity disagrees with the adopted Jπ, and the Jπ are considered well established, the discrepant multipolarity should not be adopted. The discrepancy should be pointed out in a comment. It is recommended that a flagged comment be used so that a footnote symbol appears in the mult field.

> Note 2: Since BE2 and T1/2 are equivalent pieces of data (if all quantities needed to convert from one to the other are known), and since we treat T1/2 as more basic, adopted values for both quantities should not be shown for the same level. The adopted T1/2 will in general be based on all available data, including any reliable BE2 measurements. The best BE2 value will then, by definition, be that deduced from this adopted T1/2 value and the adopted branchings, Q etc. If T1/2 comes from BE2, then quoting both values is a redundant exercise, and if T1/2 does not come solely from BE2, then quoting both T1/2 and BE2 is essentially adopting two different values for the same quantity. Note that it is appropriate to adopt a BE2 or BE3, etc. value if T1/2 is not known and cannot be calculated from these same BE2 or BE3 etc. values.

B. E(level)

The new introductory section to the Nuclear Data Sheets will include the statement "The excitation energies for levels connected by gamma transitions are taken from a least-squares fit to the adopted gamma energies. Other excitation energies are based on best values from all available reactions". For any adopted levels section for which this statement is appropriate, no further comment is needed. In cases where this statement may not be appropriate, then the evaluator should add a comment explaining the source for the excitation energies.
Uncertainties should be included where available, and should be estimated where possible if the authors do not give them (see D. 1. under GUIDELINES FOR DECAY AND REACTION DATA SETS).

C. Jπ

1. Assignments should be based on the fewest and best arguments. There are

two main advantages to this "fewest and best" approach. First, the Jπ arguments are easier to read and to follow when redundancy is eliminated. Second, alternate unneeded arguments can then be used to build up systematics. For example, consider the assignment of 1+ to a level based on the arguments "Ml γ to 0+. Logft=4.4 from 0+". Either argument by itself is sufficient. If the multipolarity argument alone is used, the logft value can then be added to the base of values from which the logft arguments are derived, thus helping to build up confidence in the application of such systematics to cases where other strong arguments are not available.

> Note: The above refers to strong arguments. For levels where only weak arguments are available, then the more arguments that can be given, the better the assignment becomes; however, remember that no combination of weak arguments constitutes a strong argument.

2. "Direct" measurements of J (atomic beam, etc.) should be referenced as 76Fu06. More recent values should be referenced directly. In either case, the method should be stated, thus "atomic beam", "NMR". Note that these methods give J only. A separate argument is needed for π.

3. Arguments should be detailed enough to convince the Data Sheets reader that the assignments are reliable and also to allow the reader to judge what the consequences would be if new data were to become available*. The argument "From (α,xnγ)" is not of much use, especially if the (α,xnγ) data set itself contains no details. Statements such as "Excit. in ((α,xnγ)", "γ(θ) in (α,xnγ)" are needed, If such arguments appear frequently, they can be included in a flagged comment on Jπ such as "From (α,xnγ) based on...", or "Member of band X based on energy fit and inertial parameter". An alternative method is to write a footnote on Jπ which states, for example "Assignments from (α,xnγ) are based on excit. and 1(0). Assignments from (d,p) are based on L values and analyzing powers. etc". For the relevant levels, the Jπ argument can then be simply "From (α,xnγ)", "From (d,p)", etc. This approach is particularly useful when the arguments are somewhat lengthy.

Gamma-decay arguments should be specific; thus "Ml γ to 2+", "γ's to 3/2+,5/2+". The gamma energy is optional, thus "326γ to 2+ is Ml", etc. The vague statement "JP is based on 'γ-decay modes" is not of much use to the reader*. Note that Jπ values and γ-ray multipolarities referred to in these comments should be adopted values; thus "Ml γ to (3/2+)", "(E2) γ to (4)-".

> * An argument for Jπ=2-,3- expressed as "L(d,p)=l gives 0- to 3-. γ to 4-", if the γ transition were to be subsequently determined as Ml, allows a reader to quickly determine that Jπ would then be 3-. If the argument had been given only as a general statement such as "From L values in (d,p) and γ feedings", the consequences of the new piece of evidence would not be so transparent.

In the specific Jπ arguments themselves, give Jπ(parent,target) when the target is not even-even. For example, "logft=5.4 from 1/2+", or "L(p,t)=2 from 9/2+".

4. Jπ arguments for two or more levels can be linked if they are interconnected in such a way that giving separate arguments for each level can

be awkward, or can give the appearance of circularity. As an example, consider the sequence 7-(β-)A(Ml)B(El)C(E2)2+. The argument "Logft=5.1 from 7- and the Ml-El-E2 cascade to 2+ uniquely establishes Jπ(A)=6-, Jπ(B)=5-, and Jπ(C)=4+". This argument can be given for one of the relevant levels, say C, and then for the others, one can say "Jπ: See C level".

5. An L=0 component in a particle transfer reaction in which S=O can be assumed, leads to ΔJ-O, Δπ=no even if other L components are present. The same is true of an EO component in a gamma transition. A level connected via an Ml+E2 γ to a level with J=l/2 must have J=3/2.

6. Jπ arguments for the ground state of an even-even nucleus are not needed. L(p,t)=O, for example, only gives ΔJ=O and relies on the assumption of J=O for the even-even target nucleus. The absence of hyperfine structure is also not conclusive since a small μ or Q can lead to the same result.

7. Maintain consistency between source data and conclusions. For example, L(p,t)=2 (S=O assumed) from an even-even target gives Jπ=2+, not (2)+ or 2(+). That is, if the L value is considered to be a strong argument for J, then it is also a strong argument for π. Similarly, if the argument is not considered strong for J, then it should not be considered strong for π; thus, L(p,t)=(2) gives Jπ=(2+).

> Note: A reaction such as (Q,d), with a measured L value, can of course Be used as a strong argument for π, namely, $\pi=(-)^{L}$, even though J is determined only as J=L-l, L, or L+l.

8. Expressions such as "preferred", or 'consistent with" are not strong arguments. Avoid these expressions since they leave open the question of whether other alternative Jπ values have been ruled out. These expressions are of course valid for weak arguments.

9. Configurations

"Conf=3/2[521]" is not a valid argument for Jπ. All that this argument accomplishes is to shift the burden of proof from establishing Jπ=3/2- to establishing conf=3/2[521]. The configuration is usually deduced from Jπ, not vice-versa, although of course sometimes the reverse is true, and sometimes the same argument for Jπ can be used to assign the configuration*. The determination of L and analyzing power in a transfer reaction might give Jπ=1/2-, and it might be reasonable to assign this level as a pl/2 orbital, but the Jπ argument should be "From L and analyzing power in (d,p)", not "From conf=pl/2". The configuration should be treated as a separate data type from Jπ and put on a continuation record. Comments on "Conf" should normally be treated as distinct from comments on Jπ.

* A measured μ will sometimes determine a specific configuration.

> In the deformed regions, the cross sections and cross section ratios, for example in (d,p) and (d,t) usually determine directly the combination JπK[ ], rather than just the Jπ, for example, 5/2-3/2[521] , rather than just Jπ=5/2- by itself.
> In such cases, the configuration must be included in the Jπ argument.

10. Do not use multiply placed transitions in Jπ arguments unless the connection with the level in question is definite.

> Note: A multipolarity determined for a multiplet will not necessarily be the correct multipolarity for each member of the multiplet (see **B. 6. d**) under GUIDELINES FOR DECAY AND REAcrION DATA SETS) .If part of the multiplet is definitely established as being connected with the level in question, then the Jπ of the level so connected can be used as a Jπ argument in the usual way, that is "γ to 3/2+" for example.

11. When Jπ choices are limited to three or fewer, it is recommended that they be spelled out rather than given as a range; thus Jπ=5/2-,7/2-,9/2- rather than Jπ=5/2- to 7/2-. There is less chance of values being misinterpreted when they are written out completely, and in many cases, the extra space required (which is the only good argument for quoting Jπ values as a range) is not significant.

12. RUL is an argument for multipolarity, not for Jπ.

13. Note the difference between "Jπ=5/2+ and 7/2-" (or 5/2+&7/2-) and "Jπ=5/2+, 7/2-". The first notation indicates the presence of two unresolved levels with Jπ=5/2+ and 7/2-, respectively. The second notation simply indicates two alternate Jπ values for a single level.

D. Other Level Properties

1. The cross referencing of data should give the data set, and not just the keynumber. The data sources are much easier to locate with this information. The method and keynumber are optional except in the following cases where they are needed.

> a) μ, Q etc., values for stable or long-lived states should be taken from 78LeZA where possible. The method should be given since these data will normally not appear anywhere else in the mass chain. More recent data can of course be quoted directly, along with the method and keynumber. For values of μ not taken from 78LeZA, and where the accuracy warrants it, a comment stating whether or not the diamagnetic and Knight-shift corrections have been applied should be included. Similarly, for Q values, a comment should be given stating whether or not the Sternheimer correction (or other polarization correction) has been applied.
>
> b) If T1/2 is obtained from BE2, this fact should be stated; thus, "T1/2: From BE2 in Coul. ex.".

2. A "g factor" quoted in a source data set should be converted to "μ" in adopted levels if J is known.

3. When branching modes are given, for example "%IT=", the bases for the values can be given here or in the source data sets. There is no need to repeat the arguments, but they must appear in one place or the other. Also, all possible modes of decay should be accounted for, unless the reason for omitting a mode is obvious.

Note: In a case, for example, where one has "%ε+%β+=99.0 1; %IT=l.O l" but β- is also energetically allowed, there should be a comment explaining why the β- branch is considered negligible; thus, for example, "%β- is negligible since the only available decay branch has ΔJ=2, Δπ=yes, for which, from logflut>8.5, one derives %β-<lxlO^{-4}". An experimentally determined limit of this magnitude should, of course, be included explicitly in the branching statement. For more obviously negligible branches such as for a case where the only available branch has ΔJ=4, one can state simply "ΔJ=4 for possible β- branch so %β- is negligible".

4. BEλ values should be included in adopted levels in cases where the T1/2 is not independently known and cannot be calculated from the BEλ.

E. Eγ, Iγ, TI

1. Sources of data should be stated unless obvious, that is, unless there is only one, or possibly two (if in a small mass chain) sources. General comments are usually sufficient; thus, "From X unless noted otherwise" or "Weighted average of values from A, B, and C".

2. The new introductory section to the Nuclear Data Sheets will include the explanation that the 17 are "photon branchings (normalized to 100 for the most intense transition from each level)". Note that an uncertainty should be included in the value "lOO" if there is an uncertainty given for the original intensity, unless there is onlyone transition deexciting the level, in which case the uncertainty has no meaning and should not be given. Any major deviation from this policy, such as quoting branching ratios in %, should be stated. Some situations in which this policy should llQt be followed, that is, where a transition other than the strongest should be chosen, and for which no explanation is needed, are

a) The strongest transition is an unresolved multiplet.

b) The strongest transition is given as an upper limit.

Note: Iγ for multiply-placed transitions where the intensity has not been divided should be given as limits (Iγ<A+ΔA if Iγ=A±ΔA), with a "&" in column 77.

3. TI should be given, where possible, for transitions which have no measured Iγ, or for which just a limit on Iγ is available. The most common cases would be for EO transitions or for low-energy transitions for which I(ce) but no Iγ (or α) are available. See Note under **J. 10.** in GUIDELINES FOR DECAY AND REACTION DATA SETS .

Note: In cases where TI is the "measured" quantity, say from an intensity balance, and α is known so that Iγ is available, it is recommended that TI as well as Iγ be given if known more accurately than TI calculated as Iγ(1+α). This allows the most accurate branching ratios for the transitions from the level in question to be obtained.

F. Mult, δ, α

1. Source of values should be stated unless obvious. Note that our new introductory section states that the α values are theoretical values based on the given mult and δ. Any α value which is not based on this procedure should have its origin explained in a comment. The sources for mult and δ can usually be quite general: thus, "Mult are based on αk and subshell measurements in and $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ data in ...". When mult are based on measurements that yield only L, such as $\gamma(\theta)$ or $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$, and you adopt M1+E2 rather than El+M2, for example, the basis for this choice must be stated.

2. See **J. 3.** in GUIDELINES FOR DECAY AND REACTION DATA SETS for requirements on consistency among the mult, δ, and α entries. α is not needed for transitions with mixed multipolarity and unknown δ, even though such values may have been used in a source data set.

3. The relation between BE2 and T1/2 allows δ (and/or α) to be deduced in cases where BE2 and T1/2 are independently known, and the ground-state branching is known (of course the ground-state branching could be deduced if all the other quantities were known).

4. $\gamma(\theta)$ and $\gamma\gamma(\theta)$ lead, in general, to two solutions for δ. Both should be accounted for. In particular, if it is not known which is correct, then both should be put in a comment. Do not put one value in the δ field and the alternate value in a comment.

5. In addition to the use of [ ] to indicate multipolarities deduced solely on the basis of the level scheme for transitions for which you. want to show the a, you may wish to use this convention also in cases where a may be negligible but you wish to show the mult because you are giving, for example, a reduced transition probability. As noted earlier, however, do not assign mult=[ ] simDlv because the mult can be deduced from the level scheme.

G. Reduced Transition Probabilities

These are required whenever calculable, that is, when T1/2, branching, mult, and δ are known. Note in particular that, for mixed transitions, values for both multipole components should be given.

> Note 1: When δ is consistent with zero or infinity, the reduced transition probability for only the dominant component is required. The limit for the other component is optional and could be given in certain cases. Thus, BE2(W.u.)<lOOO is not of much interest, but BE2(W.u.)<$l0^{-3}$ might be significant.
>
> Note 2: It is recommended that values also be given for transitions whose character has not been experimentally established but which can be determined from the level scheme as $\Delta J=l$, $\Delta\pi$=yes; $\Delta J=2$, $\Delta\pi$=no, or $\Delta J\geq 3$ (that is, cases where significant mixing is not expected).
>
> Note 3: When one or more of the relevant pieces of information needed to calculate reduced transition probabilities is missing, the calculation should be carried out if reasonable assumptions can be made that will fill in the gaps. For example, a branch with a small gamma fraction, whose mult is not known, either experimentally or from the level scheme, should be estimated (if any reasonable multipolarity would lead to a

relatively small total branching) so that reduced transition probabilities for the other branches can be calculated.

Note 4: When only limits are available for some of the relevant data, special care must be taken.

a) For a transition with mult=Ml+E2 and δ<O.l, for example, while BE2(W.u.) can be given only as an upper limit, it is not correct to give BM1(W.u.) as a lower limit since an upper bound occurs for δ=O. In a case like this, the BM1(W.u.) should be given as an average of the values corresponding to δ=O and δ=0.l with an uncertainty chosen to overlap the two values.

b) For a transition whose total intensity is known only as an upper limit, then provided that this intensity limit is not the dominant branching mode, it is recommended that the branching for this transition be treated as 1/2T±1/2TI for the purpose of calculating the reduced transition probabilities for the other transitions.

c) When T1/2 itself is available only as an upper limit, it is recommended that the resulting lower limits on the reduced transition probabilities be given. When T1/2 is an lower limit, the resulting upper limits on the reduced transition probabilities are usually not very interesting, except perhaps as noted in Note 1: above.

Note 5: The reduced transition probability for a transition for which the corresponding Coulomb excitation probability has been determined (BE2 being the most common case) can be deduced directly from this measurement and the appropriate single particle value. This procedure should be followed when the level T1/2 has been adopted from a measured BE2 (in order to avoid including the uncertainty in the BE2 twice), or where BE2 is known but branchings and/or mixing ratios are not known so that T1/2 for the corresponding level cannot be calculated.

Note 6: In cases where Eγ is poorly known, note that the factor $E\gamma^{2L+l}x(l+\alpha)$ appearing in the formula for the reduced transition probabilities may exhibit a smaller range of values than the factors $E\gamma^{2L+l}$ and (l+α) taken separately. The correlation in Eγ and α should always be taken into account in calculating uncertainties for BEλ(W.u.) and BMλ(W.u.).

Note 7: BEλ(W.u.) and BMλ(W.u.) are not needed for mixed multipolarities where δ is not known; however, if an evaluator chooses to give them, they should be given as upper limits.